DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 753 CG 006 060

AUTHOR Heaps, Richard A.
TITLE Characteristics and Perceptions of Actual and Potential Counseling Center Clients: Implications for Program Development. Research and Development Report Number 27.
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.55
DESCRIPTORS College Students, *Counseling Centers, Counseling Services, *Counselor Characteristics, Counselor Evaluation, Counselor Functions, Counselor Performance, *Program Development, *Student Personnel Services, *Student Personnel Work
IDENTIFIERS University of Utah

ABSTRACT

Descriptive data about the University of Utah student population is presented. Academic class, particular area of study, sex, age, and marital status are the prominent characteristics considered. A stratified sample of 808 students were asked to respond to four questions: (1) had they heard of the counseling center; (2) had they been there: (3) what problems did they think students took to the center; and (4) what would they like to know about the center. In addition to this data, information is presented about the actual client population and its reaction to the services received. Major suggestions for program development, include: (1) better communication with students and faculty about the services offered; (2) a wider variety of creative group approaches to counseling; and (3) development of a flexible educational-vocational counseling program aimed at meeting students' changing needs. Areas for future research are suggested. (TL)

EDO 44753

CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL COUNSELING CENTER CLIENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Assessment Committee: Jim Pappas, Chairman; Dianne Carter
Frank Fericks, Ted Packard, Karl Rickabaugh, Kathy Stoddard

prepared by
Richard A. Heaps

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research and Development Report No. 27
University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970

CG 006 060

A/243/RH
5/70/45pgs.

ED044753

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF APPENDICES	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
FOREWARD	iv
TOTAL STUDENT COMMUNITY	1
Enrollment Data	1
Academic class	1
Undergraduate college	1
Faculty-student ratio	2
Student sex and age	2
Married students	2
Freshmen, 1969	2
Veterans	3
STUDENT AWARENESS OF SERVICES	4
Awareness of Counseling Center	4
Contact With Counseling Center	5
Problems Discussed With Counselors	5
Information Requested	6
COUNSELING CENTER CLIENT POPULATION	6
Clients	6
Referral Source	7
Service Provided	8
CLIENT REACTION TO SERVICES	10
General Perceptions	10
Attitude toward counseling	10
Problems appropriate for counseling	11
Satisfaction With Counseling	12
Evaluative Factors Related to Counseling Effectiveness	13
DISCUSSION	14
Implications for Program Development	14
Publicity	14
New, creative, group counseling	15
Implications for Current Services and Research	16
Educational-vocational planning	16
Awareness of Center by non-student University personnel	17
Staff experience at Center	18
REFERENCES	20

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

Page

A. University of Utah Office of Institutional Studies. Statistical Summaries: September 1969 22

B. American College Testing Program. 1969 Freshman Class Profile Report: University of Utah. 24

C. Rickabaugh, K., & Heaps, R.A. Student Awareness of the University of Utah Counseling Center. Research Report No. 25, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.). 28

D. University of Utah Counseling. Annual Report 1968-69. 33

E. Rickabaugh, K. A study of the University of Utah Counseling: Student Perceptions. Research Report No. 28, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.). 40

ABSTRACT

This review collected and presented data from a variety of research and descriptive statistical sources to provide information about actual and potential clients at the University of Utah Counseling Center. It was hoped such information would have implications for current services at the Center, new (and needed) counseling programs, and future research.

Major suggestions for program development included a need for: (a) More effective communication with students and other university personnel about the full range of services provided by the Counseling Center; i.e., an active program of Counseling Center publicity directed at student and faculty individuals and groups. (b) A wider variety of more frequently used and creative group approaches to counseling. (c) Development of a flexible educational-vocational counseling program aimed at meeting student needs which appear to change from the beginning to end of their educational experience.

Future research suggestions included finding answers to the following questions: (a) Are the Center's present educational-vocational counseling services meeting the needs of current clients? (b) What percent of recent clients seeking help with educational-vocational planning came for only one interview? (c) Are University personnel aware of the Counseling Center? (d) Do University personnel see the Center as being able to help students? If so, with what types of problems? (e) What functions do University personnel see the Center serving? Are there consistent differences for various personnel groups?

FORWARD

During the 1969-70 school year the staff of the Counseling Center has attempted to take a thorough and searching look at the clientele, programs, and procedures of the Center. Early in the year the staff divided itself into three work groups. The task of the first was to gather as much descriptive and developmental information as was currently available concerning the population of clients and potential clients which the Center services. The second group was to consider programming and treatment innovations — as well as to evaluate current procedures — that might more appropriately meet the diversity of needs expressed by our clientele. The third group set about considering, in advance (rather unusual!), strategies and procedures which might be used in evaluating effects of the various counseling and therapeutic procedures to be employed.

The work groups have worked! In fact with surprising diligence and commitment considering the fact that we are an agency much involved in service and training activities. Following is the formal report of the group charged with assessing our potential client population. It represents a concerted effort to locate and synthesize all available data that describes characteristics and needs of actual and potential Counseling Center clients. Implications for Counseling Center program development are also included. The relevance of this analysis to the tasks of the program development and program evaluation groups is obvious.

Grateful appreciation is expressed to the several who have been involved in these projects. It has been stimulating, tiresome at times....and fun.

Ted Packard
Director

CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL AND POTENTIAL COUNSELING CENTER CLIENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Total Student Community

The information in this section is intended to offer base rate, or descriptive data about the University of Utah student population. Its purpose is to provide a context for interpreting results in later sections. Unless otherwise indicated, figures refer to daytime students only.

Enrollment Data

Information in this section is based on the Statistical Summaries: September 1969 prepared by the University of Utah Office of Institutional Studies. Data for the 1968-69 academic year will be presented unless otherwise noted.

Academic class. At the beginning of the 1968-69 school year there were a total of 16,485 students enrolled in daytime course work. The largest academic class was the Freshman class which was comprised of 4,014 students, including 2,744 first quarter and 1,270 advanced freshmen. This represents 24.3% of the total daytime student enrollment. The remaining classes may be ranked from largest to smallest, according to that proportion of the total daytime student enrollment they comprise, as follows: sophomores (19.6%), graduates (18.7%), seniors (17.3%), juniors (16.2%), and general studies -- including unclassified students (3.9%).

Undergraduate college. The five largest undergraduate colleges, ranked according to that proportion of the total daytime student enrollment they comprise, are: Letters & Science (38.1%), Business (9.6%), Engineer-

ing (8.0%), Graduate School of Education (8.0%), and Fine Arts (6.0%).

Faculty-student ratio. During the 1967-68 school year the average faculty to student ratio was 1:24.5. For lower division students this ratio was 1:52, for upper division students 1:18, and for graduate students the faculty to student ratio was 1:12.

Student sex and age. Approximately twice as many males (66.6%) were enrolled at the university as females (33.4%). The mean age for male undergraduates was 21.6 years, and for male graduates was 29.2 years. The mean age for female undergraduates was 21.9 years, and for female graduates was 31.0 years.

Married students. Male and female undergraduate students who were married represented 15.6% and 16.5% of the total male and female daytime student populations respectively. Similarly, male and female graduate students who were married represented 52.0% and 58.1% of their respective comparison groups.

Freshmen, 1969

The 1969 Class Profile Report prepared by the American College Testing Program provided useful descriptions of 2,512 first quarter University of Utah Freshmen who enrolled Fall Quarter, 1969. This number represents 84% of the 3,002 freshmen students who entered the university in the Fall of 1969.

To begin with, the mean ACT Composite score for these entering freshmen was 22.4 -- compared to a national mean score of 19.7. In addition, 94% of these students were 17 and 18 years of age -- nationally, 83% of beginning freshmen were 17 and 18 years old.

When asked to indicate their planned educational major the category selected most often by these entering University of Utah students was "undecided" (18%). Fourteen percent planned to major in arts and humanities, 12% in education, 12% in health related fields, 10% in engineering, etc.

When asked to make a vocational role preference, 27% of the students selected practitioner, performer or producer, 19% planned to be a teacher or therapist, and 18% were, again, "undecided".

It is significant to note that although 90% of these entering freshmen plan to obtain at least a bachelor's degree and 54% consider their primary college goal to be vocational, almost one-fifth of them (18%) are undecided about their academic major and the direction of their vocational goals.

Sixty-six percent of these students plan to live at home, and 81% plan to work (62% intend to work more than 10 hours a week).

Veterans

Another group that merits description are those students receiving Veterans Administration benefits (i.e., veterans). During the Winter Quarter, 1970, there were 1,458 such students enrolled at the University of Utah. Out of this group, a sample of 25 males and 1 female were randomly selected from the Veterans Administration files for study. Of these 26 students, all were over the age of 21 years and lived off-campus. Eighty percent of these students planned to obtain at least a bachelor's degree, but 11% were undecided about degree plans. Sixty-one percent of these students were married, 8% were divorced, and 31% were

single. Sixty-nine percent of these 26 students were working (47% full-time).

Student Awareness of Services

Rickabaugh and Heaps (1970) measured student awareness of the University of Utah Counseling Center during the Spring Quarter, 1967, by asking a stratified sample of 808 university students representative of the total daytime enrollment, to respond to four basic questions: (a) Had they heard of the Counseling Center? (b) Had they been to the Center? (c) What type of problem -- vocational choice, college routine, or adjustment to self and others -- they thought was most commonly presented by students for discussion with counselors at the Center? (d) What they would most like to know about the Center? Findings are summarized in the following four sub-sections:

Awareness of Counseling Center

Nearly one-quarter (23.3%) of the student sample had not heard of the University's Counseling Center.

Nearly one-third (30.8%) of the students reporting they had never been to the Counseling Center had not heard of the Center.

Differences in student awareness of the Counseling Center were evident; i.e., a larger percentage of engineering (43.5%), sophomore (35.1%), fine arts (32.5%), freshmen (27.9%), dormitory students (27.4%), and students under 21 years (27.7%), had not heard of the Counseling Center than other subgroups of students.

Contact With Counseling Center

Approximately one-quarter (24.4%) of the student sample had been to the University's Counseling Center one or more times.

Nearly one-third (31.5%) of the students reporting they had heard of the Counseling Center had been to the Center one or more times.

A larger percentage of students living off-campus (25.4%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had students living in on-campus dormitories (19.8%).

A greater percentage of male students (27.2%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had female students (19.5%).

A smaller percentage of fine arts students (8.8%) had been to the Counseling Center one or more times than had any other subgroup of students studied.

Problems Discussed With Counselors

When asked to select the type of problem most commonly presented by students who go to the Counseling Center, problems of vocational adjustment and college routine were selected by 44.1% and 43.4% of the student sample respectively. One-eighth (12.6%) of the student sample felt that problems of adjustment to self and others were most commonly presented for discussion with counselors.

There was a relationship between academic class and the type of problem perceived as the one most commonly presented by students who go to the Counseling Center; i.e., problems of vocational choice tended to be viewed as more commonly presented and problems of college routine less commonly presented from the freshman to the senior year.

Students who had not heard of the Counseling Center tended to feel that problems of college routine were most frequently presented for discussion with counselors at the Center; whereas, students who had heard of the Center tended to feel that problems of vocational choice were most frequently presented.

Students who had been to the Counseling Center one or more times felt that problems of vocational choice were more frequently presented for discussion with counselors and that problems of adjustment to self and others were less frequently presented for discussion than students who had never been to the Counseling Center.

Information Requested

Students, when asked what they would most like to know about the Counseling Center, requested information regarding the purpose of and/or services offered by the Center more frequently than any other type of information.

Counseling Center Client Population

The data in this section is based, primarily, on the University of Utah Counseling Center's Annual Report 1968-69. Its purpose is to provide information about the number and types of people seen by the Counseling Center's staff and the types of services provided clients.

Clients

Approximately 2,777 clients were seen at the Center during a one year period from July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969. This represents approximately 16.8% of the total (16,485) daytime student enrollment Fall Quarter, 1968.

It is interesting to note that, when examined by academic class, the largest proportion of counselees at the Center were freshmen (41.8%), and that sophomores (18.4%), juniors (10.3%), seniors (5.1%), and graduate students (2.9%) comprised a progressively smaller proportion of the Center's client population. Similarly, more students from the College of Letters and Science (47.2%) came to the Center than students in any other college or division.

Approximately twice as many males (64.9%) came to the Center as females (33.4%), but this is consistent with the actual daytime enrollment figures for men (66.6%) and women (33.4%). Sixty-nine percent of the Center's clients were single, 2.3% were engaged, 17.6% were married, and 2.5% were divorced.

Referral Source

It seems significant that 62.2% of the clients at the Counseling Center came at their own invitation without having been directed to the Center by someone else. In view of the large proportion of students who were unaware of the Center's existence (23.3% -- "awareness" section above) and the apparent motivation for a significant number of students to seek help by themselves, one wonders whether the use of the Counseling Center's services might not increase appreciably if people who had frequent contact with students were aware of and publicized the Center and its services. It is worth noting here that only 3.8% of the clients at the Center were referred by academic advisors, individual faculty members, and residence hall staff members. It would be worthwhile investigating the degree to which such University personnel

are aware of the Counseling Center and its functions.

The second largest referral source was the Scholastic Standards Committee which referred 8.6% of the Center's clients. These clients, almost uniformly, came to the Center seeking help with their academic performance and progress. It is likely that people on campus view the Counseling Center and make use of it in a way that is consistent with their immediate concerns or needs.

Service Provided

The regular, full-time staff members saw 26.8% of the counselees at the Counseling Center, the half-time counseling interns saw 39.5% of the clients, and the practicum students saw 27.4% of the clients. It is likely that the interns and practicum students saw more clients than the regular staff members for several reasons: (a) Clients seen by the comparatively larger number of practicum student counselors included volunteer students who were recruited for the purpose of counselor training;[1] (b) more counseling interns than full-time staff; (c) the regular staff may have seen each client more often than interns saw each of their clients; (d) interns and practicum students were more likely to see one-time informational and pre-registration clients than the regular staff; (e) regular staff members were required to limit their counseling load in order to maintain their academic, faculty rank by teaching and supervising students a minimum number of hours each

---

[1]The practicum counselors have seen an increasingly smaller proportion of the Center's regular clientele during the past two years.

quarter; and (f) the staff had an additional time limitation placed on their counseling duties as a result of other necessary, Center-related responsibilities (e.g., supervision of the Center's testing program, coordination of the Center's group counseling service, etc.).

Of the approximately 2,777 clients who came to the Center 89.3% were given individual counseling, 1.5% received interpersonal group counseling, 4.5% took part in the Center's Efficient Study Group Program, and 2.6% of the clients received a combination of individual and group counseling.

Help with decision-making and planning (often around an educational-vocational goal) was requested by 43.7% of the Center's clients, one-interview, informational requests were made by 32.4% of the clients, assistance with academic performance and progress was asked for by 9.7% of the clients, and help with interpersonal and/or intrapersonal concerns was requested by 9.2% of the Center's clients. Similarly, the staff at the Counseling Center perceived themselves as giving decision-making and planning help to 37.8% of the Center's clients, one-interview information to 35.2%, help with interpersonal and/or intrapersonal concerns to 11.2%, and assistance with academic performance and progress to 10.0% of the Center's clients. There appears to be a close relationship between the clients' initially expressed area of concern and the counselors' perceptions of the type of help actually given. It is likely that differences between the two may be the result of a clarification of the clients' problems during counseling.

Rickabaugh (1970), after questioning a representative sample of

daytime students who had been to the Counseling Center prior to the end of the 1967 school year, found that 53.3% of these students were seen only once by a counselor. Of the 104 students who had made one visit to the Center only 42.3% came with questions of college routine, whereas, 49% came for help with educational-vocational planning and 8.7% came with concerns about making personal-social adjustments. One might wonder whether these latter two groups of students with educational-vocational and personal-social concerns could have had their needs, which brought them for counseling, satisfied in one visit.

Client Reaction to Services

General Perceptions

In the study just mentioned (Rickabaugh, 1970) a total of 808 students were asked to give their perceptions of the Counseling Center by responding to objective questionnaires. This was done at the end of the Spring Quarter, 1967.

Attitude toward counseling. Students, in general, gave the Center's counselors and services a moderately positive endorsement.

Students who had heard of the Counseling Center showed a significantly more favorable attitude[1] toward the Center than students who had not heard of the Center.

Two or more contacts with the Counseling Center were found to be significantly related to a more favorable attitude toward the Center.

---

[1]Attitude toward the Counseling Center was defined as a disposition of favor/disfavor.

The attitude of students who had been once to the Center was not significantly different from the attitude of students who had never been to the Center.

The type of problem presented by students for discussion with their counselor was found to be unrelated to their attitude toward the Counseling Center.

The moderately favorable attitude students had toward the Counseling Center was found to be significantly different from the more highly favorable attitude the Center's staff had toward the Center.

Problems appropriate for counseling. Students, in general, viewed problems of vocational choice and problems of college routine to be appropriate for discussion with the counselors at the Center. Students tended to feel uncertain about the appropriateness of presenting problems of adjustment to self and others. These perceptions of the Counseling Center appear to be typical of student perceptions at most universities (Sieveking & Chappell, 1970).

Students who had heard of the Center viewed problems of vocational choice to be more appropriate for discussion with a counselor than did students who had not heard of the Center.

A significant relationship was found to exist between the number of contacts students had had with the Counseling Center and their viewpoint regarding the appropriateness of problems for discussion with the Center's counselors. Students who had been three or more times to the Center perceived problems of college routine to be less appropriate for discussion than did students who had never been and students who had been once.

The viewpoint of students regarding the appropriateness of problems for discussion with counselors at the Counseling Center was found to be related to the type of problem presented for counseling. That is, students who brought problems of adjustment to self and others viewed such problems to be more appropriate than did students who brought other kinds of problems. Students who presented problems of college routine felt those problems to be more appropriate than did students who presented problems of vocational choice.

The viewpoint of the Counseling Center staff regarding the Center's counseling role was found to be significantly different from the viewpoint of students. The Center's staff felt all types of problems to be more appropriate for discussion with counselors than did the students. The discrepancy between student and staff perceptions was most apparent for problems of adjustment to self and others.

Satisfaction With Counseling

In a recent study (Reed, 1969), 451 of the counselees who had visited the Counseling Center from October, 1968, to March, 1969, completed and returned an evaluation of their counseling experience. It was found that client evaluations were positively related to the level of training and experience of their counselor and not related to the sex of counselors, level of success as estimated by the counselor at termination, type of problem presented, and number of interviews. However, there was a tendency for counselees with interpersonal problems to evaluate their counseling experience more favorably and to participate in more interviews. A generalization from this latter trend may help

explain the existence of a relationship between counseling evaluation and level of counselor experience. It will be remembered that, when discussing the Rickabaugh (1970) study above, it was suggested that counselors with less experience than the regular staff (i.e., practicum students and interns) saw a larger number of clients, including a larger number of one-interview and vocational choice clients. Rickabaugh (1970) found that clients who had been to the Center once had less favorable attitudes toward counseling than other clients. In addition, the more experienced staff members were more apt to be selective about the type of client they saw -- a larger proportion of their clients likely to have come to the Center with personal concerns. Reed (1969) found that this latter type of client tended to come more often for counseling and rate their counseling experience more positively. It may be that experience *per se* cannot account for the more positive ratings of counselees, but that some other variable(s) is needed to provide an explanation. The studies reported below offer some suggestions.

Evaluative Factors Related to Counseling Effectiveness

Rickabaugh, Heaps and Fuhriman (1969) obtained client ratings of group counselors from 67 counselees who participated in a group counseling program designed to help students with problems of educational-vocational planning and study and learning skill deficiencies. They found that differences in counselor effectiveness (GPA change) were related to the client-perceived counselor qualities of optimism and responsibility. It was proposed that the more effective counselors felt more confident and adequate within the context of the structured group counseling approach

employed. Similarly, Heaps, Rickabaugh and Finley (1970) found that group counselors who were the most effective in assisting their clients to improve their academic performance were perceived as being the most comfortable within the counseling situation. Referring to the immediately preceding section, experienced counselors are likely to be evaluated more positively than less experienced counselors to the extent that their experience is accompanied by optimism and comfort with themselves in the counseling situations they are involved in.

Discussion

Implications for Program Development

Publicity. One of the significant findings of this review is that there appears to be a relationship between university awareness of the Counseling Center and the perception and use of the Center's services. Several points seem relevant here: (a) Nearly one-quarter of the students in one study were completely unaware of the Center's existence; (b) student awareness of the Center was related to the type of problem students felt appropriate for discussion with counselors; (c) the most frequent request from students was for information about the purpose and/or services offered by the Counseling Center; (d) students differed from the Counseling Center's staff in the functions they felt the Center performed; (e) the Scholastic Standards Committee had a need for academic help with their probationary students, were aware of a Center service for such students, and became the second largest referral source (next to self-referrals) for clients at the Center; (f) the Counseling Center is not listed

on any current University of Utah campus map, nor is it listed in the 1970 Summer School Bulletin. One of the obvious implications for such findings is the existence of a need for more effective communication with students and other University personnel about the full range of services provided by the Counseling Center, which might promote more productive use of the Center. This suggests the need for developing an active program of communication or publicity or the part of the Center. In the words of two students questioned in a study discussed above, "Why don't students know more about the Counseling Center?" and "Where were we supposed to learn about it and its functions? After three quarters of 'active' participation on campus I have yet to come across the Counseling Center!"

New, creative, group counseling. An active advertising campaign could have a serious impact on the Counseling Center's ability to deliver its services to the University community. The data in this review indicate that an increased awareness of the Center is likely to be followed by an increased number of clients with a variety of concerns, especially those of an educational-vocational decision making nature. It is highly unlikely that the Center's staff would be able to meet the increased demand for services if they continue seeing approximately 90% of their clients on an individual basis as they did during the 1968-69 fiscal year. With the probable increase in the number of students seen at the Center will come a need to devise more effective and efficient ways of accomodating them and meeting their varied needs. During the 1968-69 reporting period, less than 10% of the Center's clients were involved in any form of group counseling. In addition, the major

concerns dealt with in group counseling were usually of an academic, personal, and/or interpersonal nature. Rarely were problems of educational-vocational planning, or informational and college routine requests the major impetus for beginning and/or maintaining a counseling group at the Center. A need for developing a more frequently used and wider variety of new and creative group approaches to counseling seems imminent.

Implications for Current Services and Research

Educational-vocational planning. The data discussed in the review above strongly suggest that the Counseling Center is seen by a large percentage of students as a place to obtain help with educational and vocational planning. In fact, this perception of the Center's function becomes even stronger as students progress from their freshman to senior year. However, students come to the Center for counseling in increasingly smaller proportions as they advance along their educational program. This is true in spite of the possibility that concerns about making educational-vocational decisions increase during this same period. It may be that educational decisions (i.e., selection of a major) are made most frequently in the beginning or middle of students' academic training and that problems of post-graduation vocational planning -- a type of problem discussed much less frequently and thoroughly at the Center -- become more pressing toward the end of their programs. This raises questions about whether students perceive the Center's educational-vocational planning services in terms of providing help with defining "current" academic plans or with defining "future" career possibilities. One may also ask whether the Center is

viewed as being adequately prepared to deal with such concerns. It would be worth examining these questions since the answers would have obvious implications for the type of services offered students and the number of students using such services.

Other important questions are suggested by Rickabaugh's (1970) finding that almost 50% of a sample of clients who had been to the Counseling Center for only one visit (before the Spring, 1967) came for help with "vocational choices." It is questionable whether clients with such concerns could have had their needs satisfied in one visit. It would be worth examining to what extent clients with problems of "vocational choice" are presently being seen for one interview, and, if this is occuring frequently enough, attempting to find an answer to the question "Why?"

Looking at this discussion from another point of view it would also be worth examining the Center's current services for assisting students with educational-vocational planning concerns. Since such large percentages of the student community perceive and use the Center for help with such concerns, priority needs to be given to investigating whether current services are adequately meeting student needs and/or whether more useful methods might be found.

Awareness of Center by non-student University personnel. It was found that, in one student sample studied, a larger percentage of students living off-campus had visited the Counseling Center than had students living in on-campus dormitories. This seems significant since the residence hall staff -- people who ought to have a little more knowledge

about University services than most students -- referred only 0.3% of the clients at the Center during 1968-69. In fact, this points to a larger issue involving the finding that only 3.8% of the Center's clients were referred by academic advisors, faculty, and residence hall staff. This raises questions about why such small percentages of students are referred to the Center by various University personnel who, again, ought to have some knowledge about University services: (a) Are these University personnel aware of the Counseling Center? (b) If not, what can be done about acquainting them with the services offered by the Center? (c) What functions do they see the Center serving? (d) Do they see the Center as being able to help students? (e) If so, with what types of problems? (f) Does the staff at the Center want to be perceived the way they are seen by other University personnel? (g) If not, what can be done about those differences?

Staff experience at the Center. The fact that during 1968-69 a greater percentage of clients at the Center were seen by interns and practicum students than by the full-time professional staff raises two significant issues:

1. There is an obvious time limitation for seeing clients which is placed on the regular staff because of teaching and supervisory requirements for maintaining academic, faculty rank. It seems that one is either faculty or staff with no provision for recognizing professional people without an academic appointment. The staff's counseling time was also limited by other Center-related, administrative and consultant responsibilities.

2. Need only more experienced counselors perform effectively and be perceived more positively? In view of some research findings, it may be more useful to examine personal qualities than experiential ones. Given the identification of personal characteristics associated with counseling effectiveness (e.g., optimism and comfort) one might wonder whether such variables might be useful for counselor selection and/or whether they could be taught in counselor education and training programs. In addition to helping develop optimal personal characteristics, the staff should remain sensitive to the emergence of new and efficient counseling procedures (e.g., behavioral modification techniques) or materials (e.g., programmed study texts) which may facilitate service irrespective of experience.

References

American College Testing Program. 1969 Freshman Class Profile Report: University of Utah.

Heaps, R.A., Rickabaugh, K., & Finley, R. Clients' Counseling Evaluation Inventory ratings of counselors and academic recovery through structured group counseling. Research Report No. 23, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.)

Rickabaugh, K. A study of the University of Utah Counseling Center: Student perceptions. Research Report No. 28, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.)

Rickabaugh, K., & Heaps, R.A. Student awareness of the University of Utah Counseling Center. Research Report No. 25, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.)

Rickabaugh, K., Heaps, R.A., & Fuhriman, A. Relationship between counseling outcome and client perceptions of Efficient Study Program counselors: Two Analyses. Research Report No. 21, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1969. (Mimeo.)

Reed, M. A study of client satisfaction as a criterion to evaluate effective counseling. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah, 1969.

Sieveking, N.A., & Chappell, J.A. Reactions to the names "Counseling Center" and "Psychological Center." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 124-127.

University of Utah Counseling Center. Annual Report 1968-69.

University of Utah Office of Institutional Studies. Statistical Summaries: September 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

University of Utah Office of Institutional Studies
Statistical Summaries: September 1969

TABLE A.1 -- Summary of Daytime Student Enrollment by Academic Class Fall Quarter, 1968-69

TABLE A.2 -- Summary of Daytime Student Enrollment for Five Largest Undergraduate Colleges Fall Quarter, 1968-69

TABLE A.1

Summary of Daytime Student Enrollment By Academic Class
Fall Quarter, 1968-69

Class Level	Sex	N
First Quarter Freshmen	M	1,578
	F	1,166
Advanced Freshmen	M	859
	F	411
Sophomores	M	1,980
	F	1,250
Juniors	M	1,683
	F	991
Seniors	M	1,899
	F	951
Graduates	M	2,473
	F	606
General Studies	M	500
	F	111
Visitors/Unclassified	M	15
	F	12
Total Men		10,987
Total Women		5,498
Total Daytime Residence		16,485

TABLE A.2

Summary of Daytime Student Enrollment for Five Largest
Undergraduate Colleges Fall Quarter, 1968-69

College	Sex	N
Letters & Science	M	3,995
	F	2,384
Business	M	1,383
	F	195
Engineering	M	1,305
	F	21
Graduate School of Education	M	180
	F	1,145
Fine Arts	M	454
	F	541

APPENDIX B

American College Testing Program. 1969 Freshman Class Profile Report: University of Utah

TABLE B.1 -- Planned Educational Major

TABLE B.2 -- Vocational Role Preferences

TABLE B.3 -- Educational Plans: Degree Sought

TABLE B.4 -- College Goals: Percent of Students Rating Each Type of Goals as "Essential"

TABLE B.5 -- Housing Expectations

TABLE B.6 -- Part-time Work Expectations

TABLE B.1

Planned Educational Major

Major	U. of Utah	National
Education	12%	19%
Social, Religious	8%	9%
Business & Finance	8%	12%
Political & Persuasive	7%	4%
Scientific	9%	6%
Agric. & Forestry	1%	3%
Health	12%	10%
Arts and Humanities	14%	10%
Engineering	10%	8%
Undecided	18%	16%

TABLE B.2

Vocational Role Preferences

Vocational Role	U. of Utah	National
Researcher or Investigator	13%	8%
Teacher or Therapist	19%	23%
Administrator or Supervisor	7%	9%
Promotor or Salesman	2%	3%
Practitioner, Performer or Producer	27%	18%
None of these	10%	16%
Two or More Roles	5%	3%
Undecided	18%	19%

TABLE B.3

Educational Plans: Degree Sought

Educational Level	U. of Utah	National
Vocational Tech. (less than 2 yrs.)	1%	3%
Jr. College Degree	2%	10%
Bachelor's or Equivalent	41%	47%
One or Two Yrs. Grad. Study (M.A., etc.)	30%	23%
Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., D.D.S.)	19%	9%
Other	6%	8%

TABLE B.4

College Goals: Percent of Students Rating Each Type of Goal as "Essential"

Goal	U. of Utah	National
Academic	38%	26%
Vocational	54%	49%
Social	18%	13%
Non-Conventional	17%	12%

TABLE B.5

Housing Expectations

Housing	U. of Utah	National
College Dorm	21%	49%
Frat. or Sorority	2%	4%
Apartment	10%	8%
Off-Campus Room	1%	2%
At Home	66%	37%

TABLE B.6

Part-Time Work Expectations

Planned Work Hours	U. of Utah	National
None	19%	36%
1-9	18%	18%
10-19	43%	29%
20-29	16%	11%
30 or More	3%	5%

APPENDIX C

Rickabaugh, K., & Heaps, R.A. Student Awarencss of the University of Utah Counseling Center. Research Report No. 25, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.)

TABLE C.1 -- Numerical Description of the Sample and Daytime Enrollment Populations by Academic Class, College, and Sex

TABLE C.2 -- Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Heard of the Counseling Center (CC)

TABLE C.3 -- Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Been to the Counseling Center (CC)

TABLE C.4 -- Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Selecting One of Three Types of Problems as Being Most Commonly Presented By Students Who Go to the Counseling Center (CC)

TABLE C.1

Numerical Description of the Sample and Daytime Enrollment Populations by Academic Class, College, and Sex

	DAYTIME ENROLLMENT (N=11554)		SAMPLE (N=808)	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	3189	27.6	215	26.6
Sophomores	2358	20.4	191	23.6
Juniors	1895	16.4	184	22.8
Seniors	2656	23.0	119	14.7
Graduates[a]	1456	12.6	99	12.3
College				
Business	1058	9.2	129	16.0
Education	1640	14.2	157	19.4
Engineering	894	7.7	92	11.4
Fine Arts	703	6.1	80	9.9
Letters & Science	5109	44.2	228	28.2
Other[b]	694	6.0	23	2.8
Graduate School[c]	1456	12.6	99	12.3
Sex				
Males	7439	64.4	494	61.1
Females	4115	35.6	314	38.9

Note.--The Spring Quarter, 1967 daytime enrollment figures used do not include the colleges of Medicine and Law, the Graduate School of Social Work, General Studies and undergraduate non-matriculated students, and visitors because of the small number of students in each of the special groups.

[a]Includes the graduate school.

[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.

[c]Includes graduates.

TABLE C.2

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Heard of the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Have Heard		Have Not Heard	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	155	72.1	60	27.9
Sophomores	124	64.9	67	35.1
Juniors	157	85.3	27	14.7
Seniors	99	83.2	20	16.8
Graduates[a]	85	85.9	14	14.1
College				
Business	100	77.5	29	22.5
Education	132	84.1	25	15.9
Engineering	52	56.5	40	43.5
Fine Arts	54	67.5	26	32.5
Letters & Science	183	80.0	45	19.7
Other[b]	14	60.9	9	39.1
Graduate School[c]	85	85.9	14	14.1
Residence				
Dormitory	77	72.6	29	27.4
Fraternity & Soroity	23	82.1	5	17.9
Off-campus	520	77.2	154	22.8
Marital Status				
Single	455	75.5	148	24.5
Married	164	80.4	40	19.6
Sex				
Males	370	75.1	123	24.9
Females	249	79.3	65	20.7
Age				
Under 21	269	72.3	103	27.7
21-24	234	81.5	53	18.5
25+	116	78.9	31	21.1
Students Who Have Not Been to CC	423	69.2	188	30.8
Total Sample	620	76.7	188	23.3

[a]Includes the graduate school.
[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[c]Includes graduates.

TABLE C.3

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Who Have/Have Not Been to the Counseling Center (CC)

	Have Been[a]		Have Not Been	
	N	%	N	%
Academic Class				
Freshmen	44	20.5	171	79.5
Sophomores	40	20.9	151	79.1
Juniors	58	31.5	126	68.5
Seniors	28	23.5	91	76.5
Graduates[b]	26	26.3	73	73.7
College				
Business	36	27.9	93	72.1
Education	37	23.6	120	76.4
Engineering	21	22.8	71	77.2
Fine Arts	7	8.8	73	91.2
Letters & Science	65	28.5	163	71.5
Other[c]	4	17.4	19	82.6
Graduate School[d]	26	26.3	73	73.7
Residence				
Dormitory	21	19.8	85	80.2
Fraternity & Sorority	5	17.9	23	82.1
Off-campus	171	25.4	503	74.6
Marital Status				
Single	150	24.8	453	75.1
Married	47	23.1	157	77.0
Sex				
Male	134	27.2	359	72.8
Female	61	19.5	253	80.6
Age				
Under 21	82	22.0	290	78.0
21-24	82	28.6	205	71.4
25+	33	22.4	114	77.6
Students Who Have Heard of CC	195	31.6	423	68.4
Total Sample	197	24.4	611	75.6

[a]One or more visits.
[b]Includes the graduate school.
[c]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[d]Includes graduates.

TABLE C.4

Number and Percentage of Students in University Subgroups Selecting One of Three Types of Problems as Being Most Commonly Presented By Students Who Go to the Counseling Center (CC)

Subgroup	Vocational Choice		College Routine		Adjustment to Self & Others	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic Class						
Freshmen	77	35.8	112	52.1	26	12.1
Sophomores	84	44.0	86	45.1	21	11.0
Juniors	94	51.1	64	34.8	26	14.2
Seniors	57	47.9	44	37.0	18	15.1
Graduates	44	44.4	44	44.4	11	11.4
College						
Business	63	48.8	55	42.7	11	8.4
Education	75	47.8	56	35.6	26	16.6
Engineering	40	43.5	41	44.5	11	12.0
Fine Arts	20	25.0	45	56.2	15	18.8
Letters & Science	108	47.4	95	41.7	25	10.9
Other	6	26.1	14	60.8	3	13.0
Graduate School	44	44.4	44	44.4	11	11.2
Residence						
Dormitory	42	39.6	50	47.2	14	13.2
Fraternity & Sorority	16	57.1	7	25.0	5	17.9
Off-campus	298	44.3	293	43.5	83	12.3
Marital Status						
Single	265	44.0	264	43.8	74	12.2
Married	91	44.6	86	42.2	27	13.3
Sex						
Male	219	44.4	220	44.7	54	11.0
Female	136	43.3	130	41.4	48	15.3
Age						
Under 21	159	42.7	172	46.3	41	11.1
21-24	135	47.1	110	38.3	42	14.7
25+	61	41.5	67	45.6	19	12.9
Students Who Have						
Heard of CC	284	45.7	255	41.3	81	13.1
Not Heard of CC	174	39.4	93	49.4	21	11.2
Students Who Have						
Been to CC	100	50.8	83	42.3	14	7.1
Not Been to CC	258	42.3	266	43.5	87	14.2
Total Sample	356	44.1	350	43.4	102	12.6

[a]Includes the graduate school.
[b]Mines and mineral industry, nursing, and pharmacy.
[c]Includes graduates.

APPENDIX D

University of Utah Counseling Center. Annual Report 1968-69.

TABLE D.1 -- Client Classification

TABLE D.2 -- University Classification for Clients

TABLE D.3 -- College or Division in Which Clients Were Enrolled

TABLE D.4 -- Clients' Sex

TABLE D.5 -- Clients' Marital Status

TABLE D.6 -- Referral Source for Clients

TABLE D.7 -- Counselor Assigned by Level of Training

TABLE D.8 -- Services Provided Clients

TABLE D.9 -- Area of Concern -- Counselee

TABLE D.10-- Area of Concern -- Counselor

TABLE D.11-- Number of Client Interviews for Senior Staff, Interns, and Practicum Students

TABLE D.1

Client Classification

Classification	N	Percent
Regular Client	2498	90.0
Recruited Client	115	4.2
VA Client	164	5.9
Total	2777	100.1

TABLE D.2

University Classification for Clients

Classification	N	Percent
Freshman	1086	41.8
Sophomore	479	18.4
Junior	269	10.3
Senior	133	5.1
Graduate Student	77	2.9
General Studies Student	32	1.2
Continuing Education	48	1.8
Prospective Student	230	8.8
Other	64	2.5
Unknown	195	7.5
Total	2613	99.9

TABLE D.3

College or Division in Which Clients Were Enrolled

College	N	Percent
Letters and Science	1228	47.2
Business	159	6.1
Engineering	174	6.7
Fine Arts	95	3.6
Health, Physical Educ. & Recreation	18	.7
Law	16	.6
Medicine	28	1.1
Mines and Mineral Industries	18	.7
Nursing	32	1.2
Pharmacy	20	.8
Graduate School	19	.7
Graduate School of Education	52	2.0
Social Work	14	.5
Division of Continuing Educ.	78	3.0
Summer School (Only)	3	-
Not currently enrolled	291	11.2
Other	37	1.4
Unknown	331	12.7
Total	2613	100.3

TABLE D.4

Clients' Sex

Sex	N	Percent
Male	1686	64.9
Female	895	33.4
Unknown	32	1.3
Total	2613	99.6

TABLE D.5

Clients' Marital Status

Status	N	Percent
Single	1798	69.0
Engaged	66	2.3
Married	459	17.6
Divorced	65	2.5
Widowed	7	.3
Unknown	218	8.3
Total	2613	100.0

TABLE D.6

Referral Source for Clients

Referral Source	N	Percent
Self	1622	62.2
Friend	166	6.4
Relative	59	2.3
Academic Advisor	36	1.4
Faculty Member	56	2.1
Solicited for Practicum	115	4.4
Admissions Office	54	2.1
Dean of Students Office	37	1.4
Residence Hall Staff	9	.3
Scholastic Standards Committee	225	8.6
Teacher Certification	13	.5
Veterans Administration	6	.2
Financial Aids	99	3.8
Placement Center	2	.-
Orientation Office	1	.-
Other Individual	11	.4
Other Agency or Department	9	.3
Unknown	93	3.6
Total	2613	100.0

TABLE D.7

Counselor Assigned by Level of Training

Counselor	N	Percent
Full Time Staff	576	20.7
Interns	1104	39.5
Practicum Students	762	27.4
VA Counselor	164	6.1
Incomplete Data	171	5.9
Total	2777	99.6

TABLE D.8

Services Provided Clients

Service	N	Percent
Individual Counseling	2334	89.3
Group Counseling	39	1.5
Efficient Study Group	118	4.5
Individual and Group Counseling	35	1.3
Individual and Efficient Study	30	1.1
Group Counseling and Efficient Study	5	.-
Individual, Group and Efficient Study	6	.-
Other	22	.8
Incomplete Data	24	.9
Total	2613	99.9

TABLE D.9

Area of Concern -- Counselee

Area of Concern	N	Percent
Decision Making and Planning	1143	43.7
Interpersonal and/or Intrapersonal	241	9.2
Academic Performance and Progress	254	9.7
Informational	848	32.4
Other	83	3.1
Incomplete Data	44	1.7
Total	2613	99.8

TABLE D.10

Area of Concern -- Counselor

Area of Concern	N	Percent
Decision Making and Planning	987	37.8
Interpersonal and/or Intrapersonal	293	11.2
Academic Performance and Progress	261	10.0
Informational	920	35.2
Other	50	1.9
Incomplete Data	102	3.9
Total	2613	100.0

TABLE D.11

Number of Client Interviews for Senior Staff, Interns, and Practicum Students

Number of Interviews	Number of Clients				
	Staff	Interns	Practicum	Unknown	Total
1	310	672	466	20	1468
2	91	236	139	4	470
3	57	74	66	1	198
4	21	23	24	2	70
5	18	18	13	2	51
6-10	42	24	24	1	91
11-15	14	26	25	0	65
16-20	3	12	0	0	15
21-25	1	2	2	0	5
26-30	7	2	0	0	9
31-35	3	0	0	0	3
36-40	1	0	0	0	1
41-45	2	0	0	0	2
46-56	0	2	0	0	2
Total	570	1091	759	30	2450

Note.--VA clients and clients involved in group counseling are not included in this Table.

APPENDIX E

Rickabaugh, K. A Study of the University of Utah Counseling Center: Student Perceptions. Research Report No. 28, University of Utah Counseling Center, 1970. (Mimeo.)

TABLE E.1 -- Mean Item Attitude Score (MIAS) and Standard Deviation for Each Subgroup and for the Counseling Center Staff on Part II of the Counseling Center Research Project Questionnaire.

TABLE E.2 -- Between-Group Attitude Comparisons, Using t to Test for Significant Differences

TABLE E.3 -- Mean Item Scores (MIS) and Standard Deviations for Each Subgroup and for the Counseling Center Staff on Part III of the Counseling Center Research Project Questionnaire

TABLE E.4 -- Between-Group Comparisons On Each Problem Type, Using t to Test for Significant Differences

TABLE E.1

MEAN ITEM ATTITUDE SCORE (MIAS) AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR EACH SUBGROUP AND FOR THE COUNSELING CENTER STAFF ON PART II OF THE COUNSELING CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

Subgroup	MIAS	SD
Students Who Had Not Heard of the Counseling Center	3.53	.55
Students Who Had Heard of the Counseling Center	3.78	.58
Students Who Had Never Been to the Counseling Center	3.69	.56
Students Who Had Been Once to the Counseling Center	3.77	.66
Students Who Had Been Twice to the Counseling Center	4.07	.37
Students Who Had Been Three or More Times to the Counseling Center	4.02	.59
Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice	3.86	.65
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine	3.92	.51
Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	4.05	.65
Counseling Center Staff	4.53	.41

Note.--Items scores ranged from one (least favorable) to five (most favorable) with three representing indecision or uncertainty.

TABLE E.2

BETWEEN-GROUP ATTITUDE COMPARISONS, USING t
TO TEST FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

	t
Students Who Had Not Heard vs. Students Who Had Heard	4.77***
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Once	1.20
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Twice	4.29***
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	3.45***
Students Who Had Been Once vs. Students Who Had Been Twice	2.66**
Students Who Had Been Once vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	1.93
Students Who Had Been Twice vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	.51
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice	.52
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	.94
Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	1.67

** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE E.3

MEAN ITEM SCORES (MIS) AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH SUBGROUP AND FOR THE COUNSELING CENTER STAFF ON PART III OF THE COUNSELING CENTER RESEARCH PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

Subgroup		Problem Types		
		College Routine (12 Items)	Vocational Choice (14 Items)	Adjustment to Self and Others (24 Items)
Students Who Had Not Heard of the Counseling Center	MIS	3.87	4.17	2.78
	SD	.63	.63	.85
Students Who Had Heard of the Counseling Center	MIS	3.91	4.35	2.93
	SD	.58	.50	.88
Students Who Had Never Been to the Counseling Center	MIS	3.90	4.29	2.90
	SD	.58	.55	.85
Students Who Had Been Once to the Counseling Center	MIS	4.00	4.37	2.94
	SD	.55	.53	.88
Students Who Had Been Twice to the Counseling Center	MIS	3.91	4.37	2.67
	SD	.59	.48	.89
Students Who Had Been Three or More Times to the Counseling Center	MIS	3.68	4.41	2.97
	SD	.75	.41	1.14
Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice	MIS	3.81	4.35	2.66
	SD	.66	.51	.92
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine	MIS	4.05	4.43	2.92
	SD	.52	.47	.90
Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	MIS	3.86	4.36	3.69
	SD	.67	.43	.75
Counseling Center Staff	MIS	4.42	4.71	4.46
	SD	.09	.08	.10

Note.--Item responses ranged from one (definitely inappropriate) to five (most appropriate) with three representing indecision or uncertainty.

TABLE E.4

BETWEEN-GROUP COMPARISONS ON EACH PROBLEM TYPE, USING t TO TEST FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

	Problem Types		
	College Routine	Vocational Choice	Adjustment to Self and Others
Students Who Had Not Heard vs. Students Who Had Heard	.72	3.47***	1.76
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Once	1.41	1.15	.36
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Twice	.07	.80	1.50
Students Who Had Never Been vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	2.13*	1.22	.45
Students Who Have Been Once vs. Students Who Had Been Twice	.84	.05	1.46
Students Who Had Been Once vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	2.55*	.38	.14
Students Who Had Been Twice vs. Students Who Had Been Three or More Times	1.46	.41	1.20
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice	2.27*	.99	1.63
Students Who Presented Problems of College Routine vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	1.27	.62	3.43*
Students Who Presented Problems of Vocational Choice vs. Students Who Presented Problems of Adjustment to Self and Others	.32	.09	4.65***

* $p < .05$
*** $p < .001$